

the head, right hand extended, four-pronged figure in front of figure. Legend Greek Φ APO.

Gold medal purchased in *Kábul*. This coin is interesting from the fine bust on the obverse, and from the new legend on the reverse*.

No. 6. Obverse.—Figure of prince clad in mail, in act of sacrifice, left hand supporting tridental staff. Legend characters intended for Greek PONOPOO BONOPOVOBOKO. (*See observations on Kadphises Coins of vol. III.*)

Reverse.—Female figure, standing by side of cow. Legend apparently intended for OPNO.

No. 7. Obverse.—Same as preceding. Legend probably intended for RAO NONO POOBO RAONOKO NONO. (*See ditto.*)

Reverse.—Same as preceding. Legend probably OPNO. (*Doubtless OKPO.*)

These two gold coins were purchased at *Kábul*. They appear to be the gold coins of the prince whose copper coinage is delineated in fig. 12, Indo-Scythic coins of last year.

No. 8. Obverse.—Seated figure. Legend Greek, portion legible KOPANO.

Reverse.—Deity or saint, looking to the right. Four-pronged symbol in front of figure. Legend Greek NANA. (*See vol. iv. Pl. LI. figs. 4, 13.*)

No. 9. Obverse.—Seated figure as in preceding. Legend illegible. (*Do. fig. 5.*)

Reverse.—Deity or saint, looking to the left, with wreath in extended right hand. Four-pronged symbol in front of figure. Legend not apparent.

These coins (copper) were procured at *Kábul*, and introduced because, with reference to the seated figure on the obverse, they were of a type different from any we met with last year, although they clearly refer to the *KANERKOS* family.

Little need be remarked upon these Indo-Scythic coins, which appear to be likely to become more intelligible: suffice it to say, that eight topes in the neighbourhood of *Kábul*, at least, may be referred to princes of these families of *KANERKOS* and *KADPHIS*.

Sassanian Coins.

At the foot of Plate III. are inserted a few specimens out of the 187 silver coins of this class, extracted from the principal *Tope* of *Hiddah*, near *Jelálábád*. The majority were small coins, like fig. 6.

Monograms.

Plate IV. comprises all the varieties of monogram hitherto observed on the coins of *APOLLODOTUS*, *MENANDER*, *EUCRATIDES* and their descendants. Most of them are at once perceived to be combinations of Greek letters; but whether used as expressive of dates, or as the initials of the die-engraver or mint-master of the day, is not yet determined, although that they are the latter seems the more probable conjecture. The later symbols on the Indo-Scythic and Leonine coins, &c. are of a different class, and do not seem formed from alphabetical combinations.

II.—Quotations from original Sanscrit authorities in proof and illustration of Mr. HODGSON'S sketch of Buddhism.

[The following paper has been printed in the Transactions of the London Asiatic Society; but, from accidental circumstances to which it is not necessary further to allude, somewhat inaccurately.]

* Probably this is a transposition of the letters of A Θ PO.—ED.

The shortest way of amending these errors, and supplying at the same time some further information calculated to make the paper more generally intelligible, is to reprint it at Calcutta. This the author has, accordingly, now enabled us to do, the new information being given in the shape of additional notes, which it would indeed have been scarcely worth while to print separately from the text to which they refer. It is not our custom to republish articles already printed, and we do so now only under express invitation from the author, whose researches in Buddhism, aided by local advantages possessed by no other writer, it is of the highest importance to have correctly reported and preserved.—ED.]

PREFACE.

Several distinguished orientalisists having, whilst they applauded the novelty and importance of the information conveyed by my Sketch of Buddhism*, called upon me for proofs, I have been induced to prepare for publication the following translation of significant passages from the ancient books of the *Sangatas*, which still are extant in *Nepál* in the original *Sanscrit*.

These extracts were made for me (whilst I was collecting the works† in question) some years ago by AMIRTA NANDA BANDYA, the most learned *Buddhist* then, or now, living in this country; they formed the materials from which chiefly I drew my sketch; and they would have been long since communicated to the public, had the translator felt sufficiently confident of his powers, or sufficiently assured that enlightened Europeans could be brought to tolerate the ‘ingens indigestaque moles’ of these ‘original authorities;’ which however, in the present instance, are original in a far higher and better sense than those of DE KÖRÖS, or even of UPHAM. Without stopping to question whether the sages who formed the *Bauddha* system of philosophy and religion used *Sanscrit* or high *Prácrit*, or both, or seeking to determine the consequent pretension of Mr. UPHAM’s authorities to be considered original‡, it may be safely said, that those of Mr. DE KÖRÖS can support no claims of the kind.

* Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of London;—necnon, Transactions of Bengal Society, vol. xvi.

† The collection comprises, besides 60 volumes in *Sanscrit*, procured in *Nepál*, the very names of which had previously been unknown, some 250 volumes, in the language of *Tibet*, which were obtained from *Lássa* and *Digarchi*. But for the existence of the latter at Calcutta, Mr. DE KÖRÖS’s attainments in *Tibetan* lore had been comparatively useless. The former or *Sanscrit* books of *Nepál* are the authorities relied on in this paper. Since the first collection was made in *Nepál*, very many new works in the *Sanscrit* language have been discovered and are yet daily under discovery. The probability now is, that the entire *Kahgyur* and *Stangyur* may be recovered, in the original language. The whole series has been obtained in that of *Tibet*, 327 large volumes.

‡ These authorities however, even if allowed to be original, appear to consist entirely of childish legends. I allude to the three published volumes. The

The native works which the latter gentleman relies on are avowedly *Tibetan* translations of my *Sanscrit* originals, and whoever will duly reflect upon the dark and profound abstractions, and the infinite simally-multiplied and microscopically-distinguished personifications of Buddhism, may well doubt whether the language of *Tibet* does or can adequately sustain the weight that has been laid upon it.

Sanscrit, like its cognate Greek, may be characterised as a speech “capable of giving a soul to the objects of sense, and body to the abstractions of metaphysics.” But, as the *Tibetan* language can have no pretensions to a like power, those who are aware that the *Sangatas* taxed the whole powers of the *Sanscrit* to embody in words their system, will cautiously reserve, I apprehend, for the *Bauddha* books still extant in the classical language of India, the title of original authorities. From such works, which, though now found only in *Nepál*, were composed in the plains of India before the dispersion of the sect, I have drawn the accompanying extracts; and though the merits of the “doing into English” may be small indeed, they will yet, I hope, be borne up by the paramount and (as I suspect) unique authority and originality of my “original authorities,” a phrase which, by the way, has been somewhat invidiously, as well as laxly used and applied in certain quarters.

received hypothesis is that the philosophers of *Ayudhya* and *Magadha*, (the acknowledged founders of *Buddhism*) preferred the use of *Sanscrit* to that of *Prácrit*, in the original exposition of their subtle system, appears to me as absurd as it does probable that their successors, as *Missionaries*, resorted to *Prácrit* versions of the original *Sanscrit* authorities, in propagating the system in the remotest parts of the continent and in *Ceylon*. On this ground, I presume the *Prácrit* works of *Ceylon* and *Ava* to be translations, not originals:—a presumption so reasonable that nothing but the production from *Ceylon* or *Ava* of original *Prácrit* works, comparable in importance with the *Sanscrit* books discovered in *Nepál*, will suffice to shake it in my mind. Sir W. JONES I believe to be the author of the assertion, that the *Buddhists* committed their system to high *Prácrit* or *Páli*; and so long at least as there were no *Sanscrit* works of the sect forthcoming, the presumption was not wholly unreasonable. It is, however, so now. And Sir W. JONES was not unaware that *Magadha* or *Bihár* was the original head-quarters of *Buddhism*, nor that the best *Sanscrit* lexicon extant was the work of a *Bauddha*; nor that the *Bráhmans* themselves acknowledged the pre-eminent *literary* merits of their heterodox adversaries.

But for his *Bráhmínical* bias therefore, Sir WILLIAM might have come at the truth, that the *Bauddha* philosophers employed the classical language.

Sir WILLIAM was further aware, that the old *Bauddha* inscriptions of *Gayá*, *Sanchi*, *Carli*, &c. are *Sanscrit*, not *Prácrit*. To me this last circumstance is decisive against the hypothesis in question. Throughout *Madhya Des* and the Upper *Deccan*, the numerous monuments of the *Buddhists* bear inscriptions in *Sanscrit*, and *Sanscrit* only. The *Páli* inscription at *Gayá* is recent, and avowedly the work of *Burmese*. [It is chiefly *Burmese*, not *Páli*.—ED.]

It is still, I observe, questioned amongst us, whether *Bráhmaism* or *Buddhism* be the more ancient creed, as well as whether the latter be of Indian or extra Indian growth. The *Buddhists* themselves have no doubts upon either point. They unhesitatingly concede the palm of superior antiquity to their rivals and persecutors the *Bráhmans*; nor do they in any part of the world hesitate in pointing to India as the cradle of their faith.

Formerly we might be pardoned for building fine-spun theories of exotic upon the African locks of BUDDHA'S images: but surely it is now somewhat too late*, in the face of the abundant direct evidence which we possess, against the exotic theory, to go in quest of presumptions to the time-out-of-mind illiterate Scythians, in order to give to them the glory of originating a system built upon the most subtle philosophy, and all the copious original records of which are inshrined in *Sanscrit*†, a language which, whencesoever primevally derived, had been, when *Buddhism* appeared, for ages proper to the Indian continent.

The *Buddhists* make no serious pretensions to a very high antiquity: never hint at an extra Indian origin.

SAKYA SINHA is, avowedly, *Kshetriya*; and, if his six predecessors had really any historical existence, the books which affirm it, affirm too, that all the six were of *Bráhmanical* or *Kshetriyá* lineage. *Sangata* books treating on the subject of caste never call in question the antique fact of a fourfold division of the Hindu people, but only give a more liberal interpretation to it than the current *Bráhmanical* one of their day‡. The Chinese, the Mongols, the Tibetans, the Indo-Chinese, the Ceylonese and other Indian Islanders, all point to India as the fatherland of their creed. The records of *Buddhism* in *Nepál* and in *Tibet*, in both of which countries the people and their mother-tongues are of the *Mongol* stock, are still either *Sanscrit* or avowed translations from it by Indian *pandits*. Nor is there a single record or monument of this faith in existence, which bears intrinsic or extrinsic evidence of an extra Indian origin§.

* Recent discoveries make it more and more certain, that the cave temples of the Western Coast and its vicinity, are *exclusively* *Bauddha*. Every part of India is illustrated by splendid remains of Buddhism.

† The difference between high *Prácrit* and *Sanscrit*, could not affect this question, though it were conceded that the founders of *Buddhism* used the former and not the latter—a concession however, which should not be facily made, and to which I wholly demur.

‡ See the *Bauddha* disputation on caste. Royal Asiatic Society's Transactions.

§ See CRAWFURD'S remarks on the purely Indian character of all the great sculptural and architectural monuments of *Buddhism* in Java. Also BARROW'S remarks to the same effect in his travels in China. The Chinese *Pusá*, is *Visvarupyá Prajáná* or the polyform type of *Divá Natura*. See *Oriental Quarterly*

The speculations of a writer of Sir W. JONES's day (Mr. JOINVILLE), tending to prove argumentatively, from the characters of *Buddhism* and *Bráhmanism*, the superior antiquity of the former, have been lately revived (see Asiatic Journal No. CLX.) with applause. But besides that fine drawn presumptions are idle in the face of such a mass of direct evidence as we now possess, the reasonings of JOINVILLE appear to me altogether based on errors of fact. *Buddhism* (to hazard a character in few words), is monastic asceticism in morals, philosophical scepticism in religion; and whilst ecclesiastical history all over the world affords abundant instances of such a state of things resulting from gross abuse of the religious sanction, that ample chronicle gives us no one instance of it as a primitive system of belief. Here is a legitimate inference from sound premises. But that *Buddhism* was, in truth, a reform or heresy, and *not* an original system, can be proved by the most abundant direct evidence both of friends and of enemies. The oldest *Sangata* works incessantly allude to the existing superstition as the *Márcharya* or way of the serpent, contradistinguishing their reformation thereof as the *Bóddhi-charya* or way of wise; and the *Bráhmanical* impugners of those works (who, upon so plain a fact, could not lie), invariably speak of *Buddhism* as a notorious heresy.

An inconsiderable section of the *Sangatas* alone, ever held the bold doctrine of mortal souls: and the *Swábhávika* denial of a creation of matter by the fiat of an absolutely immaterial being springs, not out of the obesity of barbarian dulness, but out of the over refinement of philosophical ratiocination. JOINVILLE's idea of the speculative tenets of *Buddhism* is utterly erroneous. Many of them are bad indeed: but they are of philosophy all compact, profoundly and painfully subtle-sceptical too, rather than atheistically dogmatic.

At the risk of being somewhat miscellaneous in this preface, I must allude to another point. The lamented ABEL REMUSAT sent me, just before he died, a copy of his essay on the *Sangata* doctrine of the Triad; and Mr. UPHAM, I find, has deduced from REMUSAT's interpretation of that doctrine, the inference (which he supports by reference to sundry expressions in the sacred books of Ceylon), that I am in error in *deny-* Magazine, No. xiv. pp. 218—222, for proofs of the fact that numberless *Bauddha* remains have been mistaken for *Bráhmanical* by our antiquaries, and even by the natives. In the same work I have proved this in reference to CRAWFURD's Archipelago, Oriental Quarterly, No. xvi. pp. 232, 235.

Yet, no sooner had I shown, from original authorities, how thoroughly *Indian Buddhism* is, than it was immediately exclaimed 'oh! this is *Nepálese* corruption! these are merely popular grafts from *Bráhmanism*.' The very same character belongs to the oldest monuments of *Buddhism* extant, in India and beyond it; and I have traced that character to the highest scriptural authorities.

ing that *Buddhism*, in its first, and most characteristic form, admits the distinction of Clerus et Laicus. It is difficult expressly to define that distinction; but it may be seen in all its breadth in *Bráhmaism* and in Popery; whilst in Islamism, and in the most enthusiastic of the Christian sects, which sprung out of the Reformation, it is wholly lost. According to my view, Apostolic Christianity recognised it not*; the congregation of the faithful, the Church, was a society of peers, of brethren in the faith, all essentially equal, in gifts, as in place and character. On earth, there were no indispensable mediators, no exclusive professional ones; and such alone I understand to be priests. Again, genuine monachism all over the world, I hold to be, in its own nature, essentially opposed to the distinction of clergyman and layman, though we all know that monastic institutions no sooner are rendered matters of public law and of extensive popular prevalence, than, *ex vi necessitatis*, the distinction in question is superinduced upon them, by the major part of the monks laicising, and the rest *becoming clergy*†.

There are limits to the number of those whom the public can support in idleness: and whoso would eat the bread of the public must perform some duty to the public. Yet who can doubt that the true monk, whether cœnobite or solitary, is he who abandons the world to save his *own* soul; as the true clergyman is he who mixes with the world to save the souls of *others*? The latter in respect to the people or laics has a distinctive function, and, it may be also an exclusive one: the former has no function at all. Amongst entirely monastic sects, then, the exclusive character of priest is objectless and absurd: and who that has glanced an eye over ecclesiastical history knows not that in proportion as sects are enthusiastic, they reject and hate, (though nothing tainted with monachism) the exclusive pretensions of the clergy! Whoever has been able to go along with me in the above reflections can need only to be told that primitive *Puddhism* was entirely monastic, and of an unboundedly enthusiastical genius‡, to be satisfied that it did not recognise the distinction in question. But if, being suspicious of the validity

* I would not be understood to lay stress on this opinion, which is merely adduced to illustrate my argument.

† History informs us that, soon after monachism supervened upon our holy and eminently social religion, there were in Egypt as many monks almost as peasants. Some of these monks necessarily laicised, and the rest became clergy. The community of the *Gosáins*, and several others, of strictly ascetical origin, exhibit the same necessary change after the sects had become numerous followed.

‡ Its distinguishing doctrine is that finite mind can be enlarged to infinite; all the schools uphold this towering tenet, postponing all others to it. As for the scepticism of the *Swabhavikas* relative to those transcendent marvels, creation and providence, it is sufficient to prove its remoteness from "flat Atheism," simply to point to the *coexistence* of the cardinal tenet first named.

of argumentative inferences, he demand of me simple facts, here they are. In the *Sata Sahasrika*, *Prajna Paramitá*, or *Racha Bhagavati*, and also in the nine *Dharmas* (the oldest and highest written authorities), it is affirmed more or less directly, or is clearly deducible from the context, in a thousand passages (for the subject is not expressly treated), that the only true followers of BUDDHA are monks, the majority being cœnobites, the rest, solitaries. The fullest enumeration of these followers (*Bhikshu Srázaka* or *Srámana*, *Chailaka*, and *Arhata* or *Arhana* or *Arhanta*) proves them to have been all monks, tonsured, subject to the usual vows, (nature teaching to all mankind that wealth, women and power, are the grand tempters,) resident in monasteries (*Vihár*) or in deserts, and essentially peers, though of course acknowledging the claims of superior wisdom and piety. The true church, the congregation of the faithful, is constantly said to consist of such only; and I am greatly mistaken indeed if the church in this sense be synonymous with the clergy; or, if the primitive church of BUDDHA recognised an absolutely distinct body such as we (i. e. Catholics, Lutherans, and Kirkmen) ordinarily mean when we speak of the latter. The first mention of an exclusive, professional active, minister of religion, or priest, in the *Bauddha* books, is in those of a comparatively recent date, and not of scriptural authority. Therein the *Vajra Achárya* (for so he is called) first appears arrayed with the ordinary attributes of a priest. But his character is anomalous, as is that of every thing about him; and the learned *Bauddhas* of Nepal at the present day universally admit the falling off from the true faith. We have in these books, *Bhikshus Srávakas*, *Chailaks*, and *Sákya-Vansikas**, bound by their primitive rules for ten days (in memory of the olden time) and then released from them; tonsured, yet married; ostensibly monks, but really citizens of the world.

From any of the above, the *Vajra Achárya*, is drawn indiscriminately; he keeps the keys of the no longer open treasury; and he is surrounded

* An inscription at *Carli* identifies the splendid *Saliváhana* with the head of the Saka tribe, which is that of SAKYA SINHA. The *Sákya-Vansikas*, or people of the race of *Sákya*, appeared in *Nepál* as refugees from *Bráhma*n bigotry, some time after *Buddhism* had been planted in these hills. *Sákya* is universally allowed to have been the son of king SUDDHODANA, sovereign of *Magadha* or *Bihár*. He is said to have been born in the "Asthán of *Kapila Muni*," at *Ganga Ságar*, according to some; in *Oude*, as others say. His birth place was not necessarily within his father's kingdom. He may have been born when his father was on a pilgrimage to the shrine of the Saint KAPILA. SA'KYA died, according to my authorities, in *Assam*, and left one son named RAHULA BHADRA. The *Sakas* were *Kshetriyás* of the solar line, according to *Bauddha* authorities: nor is it any proof of the contrary that they appear not in the *Bráhma*nical genealogies. See note in the sequel.

with *untoured* followers, who now present themselves for the first time. I pretend not to trace with historical nicety all the changes which marked the progress of *Buddhism* as a public institute and creed of millions up to the period of the dispersion : but I am well aware, that the primitive doctrines were not, because they could not be, *rigidly* adhered to, when what I hold to have been at first the closet speculation of some philosophers, had become the dominant creed of large kingdoms. That the latter character was, however, assumed by *Buddhism* in the plains of India, long before the dispersion, seems certain ; and, as many persons may urge that the thing in question is the dominant public institute, not the closet speculation, and that whatever discipline prevailed before the dispersion must be held for primitive and orthodox, I can only observe that the ancient books of the *Sangatas*, whilst they glance at such changes as I have adverted to, do so in the language of censure ; and that upon the whole, I still strongly incline to the opinion that genuine or primitive *Buddhism* (so I cautiously phrased it, originally) rejected the distinction of Clerus et Laicus ; that the use of the word priest by UPHAM, is generally inaccurate ; and that the *Sangha* of the *Buddhist* triad ought to have been invariably rendered by REMUSAT into ‘ congregation of the faithful’ or ‘ church,’ and never into ‘ clergy’ or ‘ priesthood.’ REMUSAT indeed seems to consider (*Observations*, 28-9, and 32), these phrases as synonymous ; and yet the question which their discrimination involves is one which, in respect to our own religion, has been fiercely agitated for hundreds of years ; and still, by the very shades of that discrimination, chiefly marks the subsisting distinction between the various Churches of Christ !

Following the authority he has relied on, Mr. UPHAM was at liberty, therefore, to adopt a sense which would consist with *my* interpretation of phrases such as he alluded to, and which, of course, I found copiously scattered over the works I consulted. I always rendered them advisedly into English, so as to exclude the idea of a priesthood, because I had previously satisfied myself, by separate inquiry and reflection, that that cardinal tenet was repugnant to the genius of the creed, and repudiated by its primitive teachers. This important point may have been wrongly determined by me ; but assuredly the determination of it upon such grounds as Mr. UPHAM’S is perfectly futile. Such words as *Arhanta* and *Bandya*, (which, by the way, are the correct forms of the *Burmese Rahatun* and the Chinese *Bonze*,) no more necessarily mean, priest, clergy, than do the Latin, *fideles* and *milites*, as applied to Christianity ; and as for the word *Sangha*, it is indisputable that it does *not* mean *literally* priest*, and that it *does* mean *literally* congregation.

* *Observations*, p. 29.

If, as REMUSAT and UPHAM appear to insist is the case, every monastic follower of BUDDHA be a priest, then *Bandyā* or *Bonze** must be rendered into English by the word 'clergyman.' But there will still remain as much difference between *Bandyā* and *Sangha* as, in Christian estimation, between an ordinary parson of the present day, and one of the inspired primitive professors. Of old, the spirit descended upon all alike; and *Sangha* was this hallowed and gifted congregation. But the glory has passed away, and the term been long sanctified and set apart. So has, in part, and for similar reasons, the word *Arhata*. But *Bandyā*, as a generic title, and *Bhikshu*, *Srāvaka*, and *Chailaka*, as specific ones, are still every-day names of every-day people, priests, if it must be so, but, as I conceive, ascetics or monks merely. In the thick night of ignorance and superstition which still envelopes *Tibet*, the people fancy they yet behold *Arhatas* in the persons of their divine *Lāmas*. No such imagination however possesses the heads of the followers of Buddha in *Nepāl*, *Ceylon*, or extra Gangetic India; though in the last mentioned country the name *Arhata* is popularly applied to the modern order of the clergy, an order growing there, as in *Nepāl*, (if my opinions be sound) out of that deviation from the primitive genius and type of the system which resulted necessarily from its popular diffusion as the rule of life and practice of whole nations.

In conclusion I would observe, that, in my apprehension, REMUSAT'S interpretation of the various senses of the Triadic doctrine is neither

* The possible meaning of this word has employed in vain the sagacity of sundry critics. In its proper form of *Bandyā*, it is pure *Sanscrit*, signifying a person entitled to reverence, and is derived from *Bandana*.

Equally curious and instructive is it to find in the *Sanscrit* records of *Buddhism* the solution of so many enigmas collected by travellers from all parts of Asia; E. G. ELPHINSTONE'S mound is a genuine *Chaitya*, and its proper name is *Manikālaya*, or the place of the precious relic. The mound is a tomb temple. The 'tumuli eorum Christi altaria' of the poet, is more true of *Buddhism* than even of the most perverted model of Christianity; the cause being probably the same, originally, in reference to both creeds, viz. persecution and martyrdom, with consequent divine honours to the sufferers. The *Bauddhas*, however, have in this matter gone a step further in the descending scale of representative adoration than the Catholics; for they worship the mere image of that structure which is devoted to the inshrining of the relics of their saints; they worship the architectural model or form of the *Chaitya*.

The *Chaitya* of SAMBHU NATH in *Nepāl* is affirmed to cover *Jyoti rupya* SWAYAMBHU, or the self-existent, in the form of flame: nor was there ever any thing exclusive of theism in the connexion of tomb and temple: for *Chaityas* were always dedicated to the celestial *Buddhas*, not only in *Nepāl*, but in the plains of India, as the *Chaityas* of *Sanchi*, of *Gyā*, and of *Bāg*, demonstrate. The *Dhyani Buddhas* appear in the oldest monuments of the continent and islands.

very complete, nor very accurate. In a religious point of view, by the first member is understood the founder of the creed, and all who, following his steps, have reached the full rank of a *Maha Yinika Buddha*; by the second, the law or scriptures of the sect; and by the third, the congregation of the faithful, or primitive church, or body of original disciples, or even, any and every assemblage of true, i. e. of *conventual ascetical* observers of the law, past or present.

In a philosophical light, the precedence of *Buddha* or of *Dharma* indicates the theistic or atheistic school. With the former, *Buddha* is intellectual essence*, the efficient cause of all, and underived. *Dharma* is material essence†, the plastic cause, and underived, a co-equal by unity with *Buddha*; or else the plastic cause, as before, but dependent and derived from *Buddha*. *Sangha* is derived from, and compounded of, *Buddha* and *Dharma*, is their collective energy in the state of action; the immediate operative cause of creation, its type or its agent‡. With the latter or atheistic school, *Dharma* is *Diva natura*, matter as the sole entity, invested with intrinsic activity and intelligence, the efficient and material cause of all.

Buddha is derivative from *Dharma*, is the active and intelligent force of nature, first put off from it and then operating upon it. *Sangha* is the *result* of that operation; is embryotic creation, the type and sum of all specific forms, which are spontaneously evolved from the union of *Buddha* with *Dharma*§. The above are the principal distinctions, others there are which I cannot venture here to dwell on.

With regard to REMUSAT's remark, "ou voit que les trois noms sont placés sur le même niveau, comme les trois représentations des même êtres dans les planches de M. HODGSON avec cette difference que sur celles-ci, *Sanga* est à droite, et *Dharma* à gauche," I may just add, that the placing of *Sangha* to the right is a merely ritual technicality, conformable to the *pujá* of the *Dakshináchárs*||, and that all the philosophers and religionists are agreed in postponing *Sangha* to *Dharma*.

* *Bodhanatmaka iti Buddha*, 'the intellectual essence is BUDDHA.'

† *Dhúranatmaka iti Dharma*, 'the holding, sustaining or containing substance is *Dharma*.' Again, *Prakriteswari iti Prajna*, 'the material goddess is *Prájna*,' one of the names of DHARMA. The word *Prájna* is compounded of the intensive prefix *pra*, and *jnyana* wisdom, or *jna* to know. It imports the supreme wisdom of nature. *Dharma* is the universal substratum, is that which supports all forms and quality in the versatile world.

‡ *Samudayatmika iti Sangha*, 'the multitudinous essence is *Sangha*:' multitude is the diagnosis of the versatile universe, as unity is of that of abstraction.

§ *Prajnaupaytmakany Jaggata*.

|| The theistic sects so call themselves, styling their opposites, the *Swabhavikas* and *Prajnikas*, *Vámachars*. The *Pauranikas*, too, often designate the *Tantrikas* by the latter name, which is equivalent to left-handed.

I possess very many drawings exhibiting the arrangement mentioned by REMUSAT ; but all subservient to mere ritual purposes, and consequently worthy of no serious attention. The *Matantara*, or variorum text of the *pujarís* of the present day, displays an infinite variety of formulæ*, illustrated by corresponding sculptural and pictorial devices, embodied in those works, and transferred from them to the walls and interior of temples existing all over the valley of Nepál.

[To be continued.]

III.—*Sivatherium Giganteum*, a new Fossil Ruminant Genus, from the Valley of the Markunda, in the Siválik branch of the Sub-Himálayan Mountains. By HUGH FALCONER, M. D. Superintendent Botanical Garden, Seháranpur, and Captain P. T. CAUTLEY, Superintendent Doáb Canal.

[The fossil here described is of such importance that we make no apology for reprinting the following article entire from the outcoming volume of the Physical Researches of the Society, having prepared the engraving of the head, so as to serve both editions : it should be remarked, in regard to the engraving, that the figure of the palate and teeth is on rather a larger scale than the rest.—ED.]

The fossil which we are about to describe forms a new accession to extinct Zoology. This circumstance alone would give much interest to it. But in addition, the large size, surpassing the rhinoceros ; the family of Mammalia to which it belongs ; and the forms of structure which it exhibits ; render the *Sivatherium* one of the most remarkable of the past tenants of the globe, that have hitherto been detected in the more recent strata.

Of the numerous fossil mammiferous genera discovered and established by CUVIER, all were confined to the Pachydermata. The species belonging to other families have all their living representatives on the earth. Among the Ruminantia, no remarkable deviation from existing types has hitherto been discovered, the fossil being closely allied to living species. The isolated position, however, of the Giraffe and the Camelidæ, made it probable, that certain genera had become extinct, which formed the connecting links between those and the other genera of the family, and further between the Ruminantia and the Pachydermata. In the *Sivatherium*† we have a ruminant of this description connecting the family with

* See the classified enumeration of the principal objects of *Buddha* worship appended to this paper. Appendix B.

† We have named the fossil, *Sivatherium*, from SIVA, the Hindú god, and *θηριον bellua*. The *Siválik* or Sub-Himálayan range of hills, is considered in the Hindu mythology, as the *Lítiah* or edge of the roof of SIVA's dwelling in the *Himálaya*, and hence they are called the *Siva-ala* or *Sib-ala*, which by an easy transition of sound became the *Sewálik* of the English. The fossil has been discovered in a tract which may be included in the *Sewálik* range, and we have given the name of *Sivatherium* to it, to commemorate this remarkable formation so rich in new animals. Another derivation of the name of the hills, as explained by the *Mahant* or High Priest at *Dehra*, is as follows :

Sewálik a corruption of *Siva-wála*, a name given to the tract of mountains between the Jumna and Ganges, from having been the residence of Iswara SIVA and his son GANE'S, who under the form of an Elephant had charge of the Westerly portion from the village of *Dúdhli* to the Jumna, which portion is also called *Gangaja*, *gaja* being in Hindí an Elephant. That portion Eastward from *Dúdhli*, or between that village and *Haridwár*, is called *Deodhar*, from its being the especial residence of *Deota* or Iswara SIVA : the whole tract however between the Jumna and Ganges is called *Siva-ala*, or the habitation of SIVA : unde der. *Sewálik*.